

## AFTER THE DEATH OF JUDAS: A RECONSIDERATION OF THE STATUS OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

Josep RIUS-CAMPS – Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER

The very title given by tradition to the second volume of Luke's work, the Acts of the Apostles, is an indication of the status the apostles acquired early on in the history of the Christian Church, as great heroes whose wonderful deeds would serve as a foundation and an example for generations of disciples ever after. Among the apostles is, of course, counted Paul but the object of this study will be restricted to the Twelve, focusing in particular on the composition and significance of the group after the death of Judas. We shall be asking questions about the theological validity of the Twelve and seeking to establish whether, as the narrator, Luke intended his audience to approve of their decision to replace Judas or whether, on the contrary, he meant to express some criticism of their action. In undertaking this investigation, the traditional understanding of Acts as a book of praise of the apostles' deeds will be challenged, but it is important to bear in mind that the apostles are not thereby diminished—rather they are enhanced as real people instead of cardboard cut-outs.

The key text under scrutiny will be the opening section of the book of Acts where the replacement of the twelfth apostle is narrated (Acts 1:15-26), with reference also to the first half of the chapter (1:1-14) and the corresponding final verses of the Gospel (Lk. 24:46-53), as well as the account of the Last Supper (22:24-34).

The situation that prompts the election of a new apostle is the loss of Judas after the death of Jesus, leaving the apostolic circle as an incomplete number of Eleven. Although the majority of exegetes find no difficulty with the story of Judas' replacement, it is, in fact beset with problems, not least because it goes against the order Jesus gave to the apostles before his ascension, namely, to wait for the coming of the Holy Spirit (Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:4). Instead of obeying the command, Peter initiated a formal action of the utmost significance, both

for its legal and theological connotations: he proposed to the gathering waiting in Jerusalem that they should elect a substitute for Judas (Acts 1:15-17, 20-22), that they should find a replacement for no less than one of the representatives of the Twelve patriarchs of Israel (cf. Lk. 22:30). This was no internal business, of consequence to the apostles alone, but rather was of the greatest importance for the whole question of the Twelve's status in relation to Israel. For Luke's readers, it raises a serious question: was it right to push this election through when the apostles were not yet able to rely on the power of the Holy Spirit and when Jesus had told them that they would receive the Spirit within a very short period of time, ten days at the most? This is the question we shall be looking at.

Two basic assumptions need to be examined: first, that it was indispensable for the apostles to take action to restore the number «Twelve» before the Spirit had arrived; and secondly, that the replacement of Judas entered fully into the plan of God. The account in Acts is generally interpreted to mean that through the random system of drawing lots, God showed «which of the two (candidates) he had chosen» (Acts 1:24). And that once Matthias was elected, everything from there on ran smoothly on oiled wheels. This reading of Luke's narrative rests on the underlying belief that it was necessary to restore the circle of the Twelve come what may, in order to maintain the status of Jesus as the Messiah of Israel with the apostolic group as his appointed leaders. The question then is, why had Jesus departed from the Eleven without replacing Judas or making any mention of the necessity for them to see to it? The absence of any action on his part cannot be overlooked without distorting Luke's account. The book of Acts, like the Gospel, was written by an author who, in his own terms, set out to write «an ordered sequence of the events that have taken place among us» (Lk. 1:2-3). A close reading of his work reveals him to be a writer who was highly skilled in using the medium of narrative to convey a wealth of factual information, certainly, but also and above all, an evaluation of what this information meant in theological terms. At the heart of his concerns, is what the events narrated in his two volumes meant for the continuation of Israel, a burning issue from both a Gentile and, even more, a Jewish perspective.

If we are going to examine Luke's writing properly and in detail, it is essential that a rigorous methodology be applied. It is not enough to take the Greek text that is printed in the current editions (<sup>27</sup>Nestle-Aland or <sup>4</sup>United Bible Societies, the one on which modern translations are based), for this is a text made up of readings from a variety of documents and it masks the reality that the text of Acts is far from certain. True, the text in the printed editions is largely that of the Alexandrian manuscripts represented by Codex Sinaiticus (801) and Codex Vaticanus (B03), and it is the one that is accepted by the great majority of textual critics, commentators and translators. There are, however, considerable differences between the Alexandrian text (designated by AT) and a number of other manuscripts that, for reasons related to the history of their

discovery, are known collectively as the Western text. The so-called Western readings are conserved in Greek and Latin by Codex Bezae (D05, d05) and in the early versions of many other languages. In order to carry out a thorough analysis of Luke's Gospel and Acts, all the textual variations, omissions or additions between the main representatives of these two traditions need to be examined thoroughly. We shall take as our basic text the Greek of Codex Bezae<sup>1</sup> but throughout the discussion the variations of the AT will be indicated. To make them visually more clear, the readings of D05 that differ from the AT will be shown in **bold type**, using *italics* for differences in the order of words, and alternative readings of the AT will be shown in square brackets [].

The plan is to work through the successive stages that mark the evolution of the apostolic circle, beginning in Luke 22 and finishing at the end of Acts 1, with the aim of plotting at each point the changes that take place and their consequences.

### 1. *Jesus Confers Sovereignty on the Apostles*

The starting point for our enquiry is the speech that Jesus made to the Twelve during the Last Supper, which Luke places between Jesus' revelation that one of them was a traitor and his announcement of Peter's impending denial. Luke attaches particular importance to this moment, making use of a kind of «zoom-in» device as he moves from a general reference to the approaching festival to home in on the actual meal: «The feast of the Azymes, called the Passover was approaching» (Lk. 22:1); «The day of Passover [of the Azymes] arrived, on which the Paschal lamb has to be sacrificed» (22:7); «When the time came, he reclined at the table, and the apostles with him» (22:14). There follows the sharing of the meal and Jesus' disclosure of the traitor. The next long paragraph is of special relevance and, since readers will be familiar with the AT or translations based on it, it is worthwhile transcribing in full the version of Codex Bezae:

«Furthermore, a discussion arose among them as to **who might be** [which of them was meant to be] the greatest. He said to them: "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and those in authority over them are called benefactors. You, however, are not to act in this way. On the contrary, let the greatest among you become as the **smallest** [the youngest], and the leader as **the servant** [he who serves], **rather than as**

---

1. By taking Codex Bezae as the basic text, the hope is that the integrity and consistency of this text, which is customarily rejected as an assortment of scribal modifications, will become apparent. This is the method adopted for our four-volume commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, of which one volume has appeared to date: *Acts 1.1–5.42: Jerusalem*, London: T&T Clark International 2004.

**one reclining at table. For I came among you not as one reclining at table, but as the one who serves** [For who is (+ the  $\aleph$ ) greatest, the one reclining at table or he who serves? He who is reclining at table, surely? But I am among you as the one who serves]. **And you have grown** (ἡῦξήθητε) **as a result of my service as one who serves, you** [You, however are those] who have stayed with me in my trials; it is I who assign to you sovereignty,<sup>2</sup> just as **the** [my  $\aleph$  B] Father assigned it to me, so that you may eat and drink at my table in **the** [my  $\aleph$  B] Kingdom and **so you may sit** [you shall sit] on **twelve** [-  $\aleph^*$  B] thrones judging [+ the  $\aleph$  B]<sup>3</sup> twelve tribes [, those]<sup>4</sup> of Israel» (Lk. 22:24-30).

The account of Jesus' speech given by Luke seems to draw on two sayings of Jesus, one transmitted by both Mark and Matthew and the other by Matthew alone. The first saying appears in the passage where James and John (in Mark) or the mother of these two, the sons of Zebedee (in Matthew) ask of Jesus that one shall sit on his right and the other on his left on the day of his exaltation as Messiah, a request that causes the other ten apostles to be annoyed with them. Jesus' reply was: «You know that those who are supposed to be rulers of the Gentiles tyrannize them, and that their great men hold them under their authority. It is not like this with you. On the contrary, he who wants **to be** [to become] great among you, let him be your servant, and he who wants to be the first **of** [among] you, let him be **your slave** [the slave of all]. For the Son of man did not come to be served either, but rather to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many» (Mk 10:42-45). Matthew repeats with only slight changes the saying as it is in Mark (Matt. 20:25-28), then adds at the end a second saying, one that appears only in Codex Bezae: «**As for you, seek to grow** (αὐξήσαι) **from what is small and from what is greater, grow smaller**» (Matt. 20:28 D).

2. The word translated as «sovereignty», βασιλεία, is the same as the word for «kingdom» in the next clause. In the first instance, however, where the noun does not have the article, it is possible to interpret the noun as expressing a general concept of royal power, whereas in the second, the article before the noun causes it to designate a specific kingdom, one that is already known because Jesus has mentioned it before. To interpret the anarthrous reference to βασιλεία in v. 29 as an indefinite «kingdom» results in confusion between what Jesus confers on the apostles and the second reference to the kingdom in v. 30 (AT, «my kingdom»). Alternatively, the absence of the article in the first clause could be taken as a salience device highlighting the word «kingdom» (see S.H. LEVINSON, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics 1992), the purpose of which would be to contrast the apostles' misplaced ambitions of grandeur with the greatness which Jesus will give them in the heavenly kingdom.

3. The absence of the article in D05 has the effect of underlining the «twelve tribes» and thereby the correspondance between the apostles and the tribes of Israel.

4. The translation in brackets here seeks to reflect the emphasis given by B03 (and P<sup>75</sup>) through its word order and the presence of the article before the number twelve: τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (κρίνοντες δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ D).

It is symptomatic that both sayings referring to «growth» only appear in the Western text, although the same play on words is to be found in Jn 3:30 in John the Baptist's declaration about his role compared with that of Jesus. Even though the phrasing is different in Matthew and Luke, in both the Bezan readings there is the sense that Jesus is criticising the apostles' notion of greatness and encouraging them to seek the greatness that comes from service. In Luke in particular, he points out that the greatness that the apostles have is because of his serving them, not because of their own merit. By omitting the sayings, in each case the AT lightens the critical tone and lessens the harshness of the rebuke. This way of protecting the reputation of the apostles will be seen, once the incidents in Acts are tackled, to be characteristic of the AT, as if the complaint of Jesus had become too hard on the ears of a church founded on apostolic tradition.

Following Jesus' teaching on service and greatness, Luke then adds another saying, which in Matthew is found in the story of the rich young man as follows: «Jesus said to **them** (the disciples) [to him (Peter)]: "In truth I say to you that you who have followed me in the new birth, when the Son of man sits on the throne of his glory (cf. Matt. 25:31), you will also sit on twelve (δεκα-δύο D || δώδεκα  $\aleph$  B) thrones judging [+ the  $\aleph$  B] twelve tribes of Israel"» (Matt. 19:28). By keeping the promise of the kingdom, which Jesus had already spoken of to the apostles (cf. Lk. 12:32), for the end of the Last Supper and by framing it with the announcement of Judas' betrayal before and Peter's denial after it, Luke places extraordinary emphasis on the teaching contained in this saying about the kingdom. He has Jesus pronounce it at the precise moment when the Twelve were heatedly debating which of them would be the most important. As is his custom, Luke has taken existing material and has rearranged it so as to set Jesus' total giving of himself, in his taking the position of a servant, against the fight going on among the Twelve for positions of power, the same mentality that will lead to both betrayal and denial. At the peak of their ambition which had led them to think of themselves as people of importance, Jesus, instead of rebuking them for their arrogance, shares with them the sovereignty that the Father had conferred on him. He reminds them that if they continue at his side and remain complete (as a group of Twelve), they will be able to sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. At this point, Jesus still hopes that the Twelve, Judas included, will come through the failures that are about to follow and share the table with him in the kingdom whose appearance is imminent.

## 2. *The Death of Judas Iscariot*

It is somewhat surprising to consider that in Luke's organisation of the material, at the point when Jesus conferred sovereignty on the apostles and

spoke of them as a group of Twelve he knew about the betrayal of Judas. Luke records the deal arranged between Judas and the Temple authorities before the day of Passover (Lk. 22:3-7) so that when Jesus met with the apostles to eat the Passover meal the betrayal had already been set up. Even as Satan enters Judas, Luke underlines his place in the apostolic group by describing him as «one of the number of the Twelve» (ὅντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, 22:3). The insistence on his being one of the Twelve will be repeated twice: first by Luke, at the time when he hands over Jesus (εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, Lk. 22:47) and again by Peter as part of his argument about the need to replace him (ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, Acts 1:17).

Since Jesus continued to include Judas among the apostles as he conferred on them sovereignty and assigned to them a seat of royal power at his table in the kingdom where they would be judging the twelve tribes of Israel, he gave no indication whatsoever that Judas' betrayal would cause him to lose his place among the Twelve apostles. He addressed them as Twelve and saw them as Twelve in the future after his death, Judas among them. This, to our way of thinking, may well be troubling (surely a betrayer of the Messiah cannot continue to be his apostle?) but there is a comment in the account of his actual handing over of Jesus to the authorities that shows how this could be so because a similar betrayal had already happened in the early history of Israel, on the part of the patriarch who bore the name of Israel itself, Jacob. As Judas led the crowd towards Jesus on the Mount of Olives, he indicated who Jesus was by going up to him and giving him a kiss. The wording of the AT has nothing extraordinary: ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν (22:47 ὧ B). The wording of D05 varies slightly: ἐγγίσας ἐφίλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, and to all intents and purposes says exactly the same thing as the AT. The difference is that the D05 text repeats exactly the wording used to describe the kiss Jacob gave his father Isaac: ἐγγίσας ἐφίλησεν αὐτόν (Gen. 27:27 LXX). The implication is that for all his deceit and treachery, Judas, no less than Jacob, retained his place among the leaders of Israel.

If not his betrayal then what was it that caused Judas to lose his place among the Twelve apostles? As Luke explains in the comment he inserts in the middle of Peter's speech in the upper room in Acts 1 (vv. 18-19), it was his death: the need for replacing him arises because he has died the death of a godless man. Matthew reports his death as a suicide, after he had repented of what he had done (Matt. 27:3-5); Luke does not make it clear that he killed himself but he does describe his death in a gruesome manner that was known to be that of a godless person (Acts 1:18, cf. Wis. 4:19).<sup>5</sup> With a play on words in Aramaic that was typical of Jewish methods of interpreting Scripture, he shows

5. Wis. 4:19: «They will become a dishonoured corpse ..., he will throw them ... headlong (περηνής) ..., they will remain a desert to the end.»

how Judas exchanged his «share» (ἡν, cf. κλήρος, 1:17) in Israel for a «field (ἔκρη) of blood» (Ἀκελδαμάχ 'in their language', 1:19).<sup>6</sup> By the manner of his death, Judas' part in Israel has become a place of shame and impurity.

Judas' death destroys the group of the Twelve (οἱ δώδεκα ἄβ· D) in that it becomes a group of Eleven (οἱ ἑνδεκα). This new number is reported by Matthew (Matt. 28:16) and emphasised repeatedly by Luke.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. *Jesus Does not Replace Judas*

Since it was Jesus himself who chose the original Twelve, including Judas (Lk. 6:13.14-16),<sup>8</sup> under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:2), it would be expected that he would choose the replacement for Judas after the number fell to Eleven with his death. But he did nothing, nor gave any kind of order that the remaining apostles should see to it. Instead he told them to go to the city of Jerusalem and wait for the Holy Spirit (Lk. 24:49; cf. Acts 1:4-5).

The apostles must have found this lack of action on Jesus' part very difficult to comprehend for they had understood their role as representing the Twelve Patriarchs of Israel and knew that the full number was of prime importance because of their association with him as the Messiah. On his last day with them, their ongoing belief in the ancient Messianic expectations is seen in their attempt to get Jesus to restore the circle of the Twelve. According to Codex Bezae, the Eleven «got together and started to question him, saying (ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, impf.): "Lord, is it at this time that you are going to restore into the kingdom of Israel...? (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ...;)"» The question is left hanging in the air, for Jesus cut them short (καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ + aor. interrupting the impf.) without allowing them to say what it was they wanted him to restore to Israel. From what Jesus has been teaching them, many of the expectations for the restoration of the kingdom of Israel in the days of the Messianic age were fulfilled or would be when the Spirit came. One important element, however, is incomplete and that is the restoration of the twelve tribes. As pointed out above, they have understood quite clearly from Jesus' teaching so far that they, the Twelve apostles, represent the twelve tribes. But at this critical time, there are only eleven of them—when is Jesus going to do something about the twelfth? When will he restore the twelfth tribe, the twelfth apostle, into the kingdom? In the AT, the question was not left unfinished: «They started to ask him, saying (ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, impf.): "Lord, is it at this time that you are going to restore the

6. The play on words is pointed out by M. WILKOX, «The Judas-Tradition in Acts 1:15-26», *NTS* 19 (1973) 438-452 (447-449).

7. Lk. 24:9.33; Acts 1:13 (11 names).26 (ἑνδεκα ἄβ B D); 2:14 (ἄβ B; δέκα D\*); cf. Mk. 16:14.

8. Cf. Mk. 3:14.16 ἄβ B (-D).16-19 (12 names); Matt. 10:2-3 (12 names); Jn 6:7.

Kingdom to Israel? (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ;)"» In both texts, Jesus did not give them an answer to their question, telling them that the time of things was not their concern but instead, their responsibility was to be his witnesses.

It is useful to draw together here a series of points concerning Jerusalem which depend for their interpretation on the way Luke makes use of the dual spelling in Greek<sup>9</sup> to distinguish between the religious institution with the Temple and the Jewish authorities (Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ierousalem) and the city as a geographical place of neutral religious significance (Ἱεροσόλυμα, Hierosolyma):

1. Jesus led the apostles out of Ierousalem: at the end of the Gospel account, Luke notes that Jesus «led them (the Eleven) **out** [– B P<sup>75</sup>]) **towards** (ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω πρὸς) [to the vicinity of (ἔως πρὸς)] Bethany» (Lk. 24:50, cf. 24:33). The combination of the verb «lead out» (ἐξαγαγεῖν ἔξω – which is precisely that used repeatedly for the exodus of the people of Israel under the leadership of Moses from their slavery to Egypt) with the Hebrew-derived spelling of Jerusalem, Ierousalem – Ἱερουσαλήμ, expresses the theological truth that Jesus was taking the apostles out of the Jewish system of beliefs and expectations, removing them from the religious authority and the institution of the Temple
2. After his death and his resurrection, Jesus ordered the apostles to stay in the city and to stay there until they had received the Holy Spirit (καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει, Lk. 24:49); they were to wait in Hierosolyma for the Father's promise (ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι, Acts 1:4). In other words, they were not go back to the religious institution (Ierousalem) nor were they to undertake any kind of action
3. He entrusted the Eleven with a mission: while they were still in Jerusalem, he told them they were to «preach repentance in his name **and the** (καί) [for the (εἰς)] forgiveness of the sins (ἁμαρτιῶν) **with a view to reaching** (ὡς ἐπὶ) [to (εἰς)] all the Gentiles, starting **with those** (i.e. sins) of Ierousalem (ἀρχαμένων ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ) [starting from Ierousalem (ἀρχάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ)]» (Lk. 24:47) // on the Mt of Olives, he instructed them to be his «witnesses, **both** in Ierousalem (ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλήμ) **and** (καί) [and in (καὶ ἐν)] all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth (καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς)» (Acts 1:8)
4. The Eleven went against Jesus' orders, as emphasised in both the Gospel and Acts: «They returned to Ierousalem (ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ) with **great** [– B\*] joy and they stayed continually in the

9. For a detailed discussion of the difference in meaning Luke establishes between the two spellings of Jerusalem (Ἱερουσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα), see READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: The Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, London: Sheffield Academic Press 2002, pp. 318-344.



Temple (καὶ ᾗσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) **praising** [blessing] God» (Lk. 24:52-53) // «Then they returned to Ierousalem from the mount called Olives, which is near Ierousalem, a Sabbath day's journey away (τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλὴμ σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν)» (Acts 1:12). Despite Jesus' clear instructions and despite his taking them out of Ierousalem, the apostles continued to be fully identified with the Jewish establishment and with the Temple of Jerusalem

The fact that Jesus took no action to replace Judas or left no instructions concerning the need to find a twelfth member of the apostolic circle is in keeping with his insistence on the separation of the apostles from the traditional system of Ierousalem and also with his orders that they should simply «wait» in Hierosoluma (Acts 1:4 // «sit in the city», Lk. 24:49) until the coming of the Holy Spirit. Their return to the Temple and their action to choose a replacement for Judas is, in contrast, quite incompatible with his instructions.

#### 4. *The Threat Posed by the Presence of Jesus' Brothers*

According to Luke's narrative of the ascension scene in Acts 1:9-11, the Eleven were full of expectation that they would experience a re-enactment of the ascension of Elijah and, like his disciple Elisha, would receive his spirit as they watched him go (cf. 2 Kgs 2:9-12).<sup>10</sup> Not only did they receive nothing, but furthermore they were told by two men to stop gazing at the sky. This detail is one more indication that the apostles had only a partial understanding of what Jesus was about at the point when he left them. It is not surprising, therefore, that they are not yet ready to separate from the religious authority of Judaism nor, as Luke insists with the repetition of the name for the holy city, Ierousalem (Acts 1:12), that they return there after Jesus' departure (1:13): they «entered (Ierousalem) and went up to the upper room where they remained expectantly». There follows the list of the names of the Eleven, underlining the absence of the twelfth name, that of Judas Iscariot, at the end of the list (cf. Lk. 6:16) and their incompleteness as representatives of the patriarchs of Israel. The «upper room» is the equivalent of the location of the Temple reported in the corresponding account of the Gospel (Lk. 24:53); just as in the Temple, they «were continually praising [blessing] God», so in the upper room «they continued steadfastly ... in prayer» (Acts 1:14a).

10. RIUS-CAMPS and READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message*, I, p. 92.

A new group of characters is, however, introduced into the Acts account at this point, namely, the family of Jesus with whom, along some women (and children, D), the Eleven were together praying: «with **their women and children** [some women], and **Mary** [Mariam], [the] mother of Jesus, and [with] his brothers» (1:14b). Luke's description of the group falls into three parts: at the beginning of the list are the Eleven and at the end, the brothers of Jesus; in between the two groups of male participants, who are thus set in contrast to one another, are the women (and children, D) including Mary. They are all united in prayer, waiting for the fulfilment of the Father's promise. The presence of Jesus' brothers might almost go unnoticed for Luke does not say anything about how they have become aware of the gathering in the upper room nor does he give any explanation about what they are doing there. But it is precisely his silence at this point that means that careful attention must be paid to the fact that Luke never included them among his disciples during Jesus' lifetime (see Lk. 8:19-20; cf. Mk 3:31-35). It seems that at a late date they have come to believe in him as the Messiah (1Cor. 9:5; 15:7; Gal. 1:19; 2:9.12), and as his family they have claims through their blood ties to represent him as the Messiah, the ruler of Israel, and they will obviously be anxious to make sure these claims are recognized. The drama for the apostles is that they have a rival claim to represent the Messiah, specifically in their function as the Twelve. But since the death of Judas has brought their number down to Eleven, their claim is damaged and the presence of the brothers of Jesus are a threat to the continuation of their role.

### 5. *Peter's Intervention*

As was noted in the above section, Luke does not spell out the problem posed by the brothers of Jesus in the upper room. His work, indeed, is full of unexplained problems which only become apparent when the narrative is read in the context of its first century Jewish setting. For a modern-day reader, the difficulty is accessing sufficient information to be able to see and make sense of all the implicit information contained in Luke's writing. It is precisely the information that Luke does not spell out that gives us clues today as to the identity of his intended audience. There are many such clues in Codex Bezae that he was addressing a person who knew well the situation facing the early believers in Jesus and understood it because he shared their cultural and religious inheritance. These are strong reasons for identifying the «most excellent Theophilus» as the high priest who held office between 37 to 41 CE, one of the five sons of Annas and brother in law of Caiaphas.<sup>11</sup> He would have known

---

11. This hypothesis was first formulated by R.H. ANDERSON, «A la recherche de Théophile» in *Saint Luc. Évangéliste et historien. Dossiers d'Archéologie*, 2002-2003, p. 278.

without further explanation the powerful tension in the air between the two antagonistic groups in the upper room, each claiming to be the heirs of the Messiah, and would have sensed the potential for a dramatic explosion among the people closest to Jesus. This tension, which is forceful in the Bezan text is considerably attenuated in the AT by a series of 27 variant readings which, over the short span of 12 verses (Acts 1:15-26), alter significantly the message that sets the tone for the whole book.

During the ten-day period (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις) that Jesus had set for them to wait for the coming of the Holy Spirit, it was Peter who took the initiative to deal with the conflict of interests created by the presence of the brothers of Jesus with the Eleven in the upper room. In disobedience to the order of Jesus to «remain seated (καθίσατε) in the city», he «stood up (ἀναστὰς) in the midst of the **disciples** [brothers]» and started speaking, «**for the number of the** [there was a number of] persons gathered together with one same purpose (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό) corresponded to (ὥς B D) [approximately (ὥσεί K) one hundred and twenty» (i.e. the minimum to represent Israel, 10 for each tribe).<sup>12</sup> The placing of the parenthetic insertion between «he said» and the start proper of the speech, «Men brothers», serves to emphasize that Peter had decided to speak only after having seen that he had a sufficient quorum. According to the Codex Bezae, there is no doubt that the circle to which Peter addresses himself is that of the «disciples» of Jesus, pointedly ignoring the brothers of the Messiah. The variant «brothers» of the AT is ambiguous since it could quite well include Jesus' siblings.

There are two variants in the opening of the speech that change the meaning of the scriptural argument adduced by Peter for proposing a course of action: «Men brothers, **it is necessary** (δεῖ D\*, *oportet* d) [it was necessary (ἔδει K B D<sup>A</sup>)] that **this** [- K B] passage of the Scripture spoken beforehand by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David concerning Judas should be fulfilled» (Acts 1:16). In fact, according to the Codex Bezae, Peter understood that the scriptural passage had yet to be fulfilled («it is necessary» in present tense, and the clarification «this passage»). On the other hand, according to the AT it had already been fulfilled («it was necessary», imperfect tense). In Codex Bezae, the reference is to the passage that Peter will cite following an explanatory digression, namely, two extracts from the Psalms, Pss. 68:26 and 108:8 (Septuagint numbering). In the AT, it refers either to some other unnamed passage, or to the first half only of the quotation that follows in v. 20 as a reference to the «field of blood» in which Judas died and which has to remain uninhabited. Whether in the present or imperfect, the impersonal verb Peter uses, δεῖ/ἔδει, is the one commonly used to express the divine will. Peter believes that what he is proposing is in line with what ought to happen according to God's plan:

12. See m. Sanh. 1:6, cf. y. Sanh. 1:4, where mention is made of the principle of ten people to represent each tribe.

he will find a way to argue for replacing Judas that does not completely disregard the fact that Jesus did not consider it necessary to take any such action.

Peter justifies the need to replace Judas by stating that he was «numbered among us and obtained the share of this ministry» (1:17), using a phrase from the Palestinian Targum to Gen. 44:18, which had become a typical definition of one of the Patriarchs of Israel.<sup>13</sup> The reason, in other words, for replacing Judas is that he was one of the Twelve apostles and because of the assimilation of the apostles with the Patriarchs of Israel the number had to remain at twelve. In his speech, Peter prepares to restore the number «Twelve», thereby preventing the brothers of Jesus from claiming their blood rights.

Both passages of the Psalms that Peter cites refer —according to the Codex Bezae— to Scripture that has yet to be fulfilled. The two quotations are fused into one:

- 1) «Let his estate be made desolate and **let there be no-one** (μη̃ ἦ D\*) [let no-one (μη̃ ἔστω B D<sup>C</sup>)] dwelling [dwell] in it», Ps. 68:26
- 2) «Let another take his office», Ps.108:8

The two quotations express complementary truths which refer to different aspects of Judas' role as a representative of a patriarch of Israel. Luke has just explained how Judas forfeited his share in Israel by converting it, through his gruesome death, into a «field of blood» (see § 3 above). Peter has understood that Jesus did not wish to have another take over his share and so applies to this situation the idea from the Psalms that his «estate» must be left vacant: no-one can take over his place as one of the original Twelve, chosen by Jesus through the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:2). But at the same time, Peter, wanting to fill the gap left by Judas and to prevent any of Jesus' brothers laying claim to their right to take over from Jesus, comes up with another Scripture to justify electing a replacement to do the work assigned to the Twelve apostles, the «office», and to keep the number of active apostles as Twelve. The seat will be left empty as a sort of memorial to Judas but someone else will carry on his apostolic function.

## 6. *The Conditions for the Replacement Candidate*

Having argued for the necessity of finding a replacement to carry on Judas' ministry, Peter goes on to set out the conditions that the candidates must meet: «one of the men who accompanied us during all **the** [– B] time **while** (ὥς D\*) [in which (ὥς B D<sup>s.m.</sup>)] the Lord Jesus the **Messiah** [– B] went in and out among us beginning from the baptism of John, to the day that he was taken

13. WILCOX, «The Judas-Tradition in Acts 1.15-26», 447-448.

up away from us, of these one must become a witness with us of his resurrection» (1:21-22). It is quite clear to Peter that it is they, the disciples, who have to carry through the plan of the Messiah Jesus, and not his brothers. To prevent any possibility that one of Jesus' brothers might be proposed to step into the gap, he stipulates that he must have been a disciple of Jesus from the beginning to the time of the ascension, a condition that none of the brothers of Jesus can claim to fulfil (cf. Lk. 8:19-20) even though it was true that the brothers of Jesus and, in particular, James, had had an experience of the resurrection of Jesus (cf. 1Cor. 15:7).

### 7. *The Presentation of the Candidates*

As the narrator takes over the discourse, once again Codex Bezae diverges significantly from the AT: «And **he proposed** (ἔστησεν D\*) [they proposed (ἔστησαν & B D<sup>A</sup>)] two of them: Joseph, called **Barnabas** (Βαρναβᾶν) [Barsabbas (Βαρσαββᾶν)] who had been named the Righteous, and Matthias» (Acts 1:23). According to Codex Bezae, Peter continues to take a lead in proposing the two candidates, they are his choice and there is good reason to believe that they are named in order of his preference. Of the first candidate, two qualities are highlighted, one in present tense (τὸν καλούμενον Βαρναβᾶν/Βαρσαββᾶν), that is, it was currently active, and the other in aorist tense, that is, it had already been acquired and within a Latin speaking milieu (ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος – a Latin name in Greek form). About the second candidate, Matthias, nothing is said except his name. Joseph, in contrast, is described in positive terms that highlight his qualifications for election. The «Righteous» is, indeed, high praise but if this person is «Joseph Barsabbas» there is little point in the information since this character is not mentioned again. On the other hand, if he is «Joseph Barnabas», the information is considerably more noteworthy for he will re-appear in Acts 4:36-37 and will continue to function within the story of Acts as a model of encouragement. The name of Barnabas will be explained at 4:36 as meaning «the Son of encouragement» or «consolation», where it will be said that Joseph had already acquired the name from the apostles (ὑπὸ [ἀπὸ] τῶν ἀποστόλων); according to Codex Bezae, it was after the departure of Jesus that he first began to be known for his gift of encouragement or consolation. More information concerning Joseph Barnabas will come to light at the mention in Acts 4 which it is well to note now. Luke reveals telling facts concerning his origins, namely (according to Codex Bezae), that he was a «Cypriot» (Κύπριος) and belonged to the «tribe of Levi» (Λευίτης τῷ γένει), that is, to a Jewish family resident in the Diaspora. The AT, by reversing the order of the words, has him as «a Levite, of Cypriot race» (Λευίτης, Κύπριος τῷ γένει), suggesting that his family would have come from Cyprus and that he was a Jewish proselyte.

All this information fits together in Codex Bezae and explains why Luke suggests that Joseph was the preferred candidate. He was known as «the Righteous» (*Justus*, Ἰουστος, צדיק), the highest moral quality that a Jew could attain, while he resided in Cyprus, in the Diaspora, in a Latin speaking environment. Now that Peter was proposing a candidate to exercise the apostolic function that Judas had represented, while leaving his «estate» vacant, the most suitable person was a Levite. For the Levites were the one tribe that had not been assigned any territory when the land of Israel was shared out (Deut. 10:9; 18:1-2), theirs being a special ministry that had no need of land; within this realm of spiritual reality whereby the present is assimilated with the past in typical Jewish fashion,<sup>14</sup> Peter's first proposed candidate was ideally suited to an apostolic function for which there was no patriarchal land («estate», ἔπαυλις) to go with it. At the same time, Peter was trying to bring into the restored apostolic circle an individual from among the Hellenist Jews, a group hitherto unrepresented since all the Eleven were from the land of Israel. If his proposal had been accepted by the assembly and Barnabas had become one of the apostles, it is possible to think that the attacks of the Hellenists against the Jesus-believers that erupted later could have been avoided (cf. Acts 6:1ff.)

#### 8. *The Assembly's Prayer to God*

Once the candidates had been named, the assembly of the Hundred and Twenty prayed. The AT is somewhat ambiguous in prefacing the prayer with the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun, a pronoun that is not found in Codex Bezae: «[+ You Ṛ B] Lord, who know all hearts, show which [+ one Ṛ B D<sup>D</sup>] of these two you have chosen to **take up a place, that** [occupy the place] of this apostolic ministry from which Judas fell away, to go to the place that was proper for him» (Acts 1:24-25). The addition of the pronoun might lead one to think that it was Jesus who was being addressed. According to Codex Bezae, however, there is no doubt that the prayer was addressed to God since he is described as the «knower of hearts» (καρδιογνώστης), a qualification used explicitly of God on the only other occasion on which it appears in the New Testament (cf. Acts 15:8) and which is not found in either the LXX or other pre-Christian literature.

---

14. In Jewish thought, the whole of the history of Israel is contained in the Torah, with the incidents recorded in it acting as paradigms for later events and people. This understanding of history accounts for the significance that could be attached by the participants in Acts (as well as Luke and Theophilus) to the tribe of Levi to which Joseph Barnabas belonged. There are further allusions of the same nature embedded in the text of Codex Bezae to the person of Joseph son of Jacob. These are discussed in detail in READ-HEIMERDINGER, «Barnabas in Acts: A Study of his Role in the Text of Codex Bezae», *JSNT* 72 (1998) 23-66.

Luke has constructed this prayer in parallel to that of Jesus when electing the Twelve (Lk. 6:12-13), though with some notable differences. Jesus' prayer was preceded by an *exodus*, away from the synagogue towards the mountain (ἐγένετο δὲ ... ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος, Lk. 6:12a) where he had refuge away from the Scribes and Pharisees who were wanting to get rid of him (Lk. 6:6-7.11 D). In contrast, the prayer of the Eleven and the rest of the disciples occurs in the *upper room*, the equivalent of *the Temple* (cf. Lk. 24:52), after the Eleven had turned back from the Mt of Olives to Ierousalem (see § 3 above). Jesus' prayer lasted *a whole night long* (καὶ προσεύχεσθαι [προσεύξασθαι Ⲛ B P<sup>75</sup>] καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ [+ τοῦ θεοῦ Ⲛ B P<sup>75</sup>], Lk. 6:12b D), a period of darkness corresponding to the the enmity of the Pharisees and Scribes who had aroused his anger (ἐν ὀργῇ, Lk. 6:10 D). The prayer of the Hundred and Twenty was made once, as a single utterance (καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπαν). Jesus chose the Twelve (ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα) from among his disciples when *day came* (ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, Lk. 6:13a), that is, when he saw clearly the choice he should make, thanks to the inspiration provided by the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 1:2a: διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗς ἐξελέξατο). In the case of the Hundred and Twenty disciples, once they have prayed they will make their choice with *human means*, without yet being able to count on the force of the Holy Spirit, although they did ask God to show which of the two candidates he had elected (ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο). Just how God «showed» it varies according to the text followed, as we shall see below.

The other variant, apparently insignificant (ἀναλαβεῖν τόπον τόν... D\* [ἐνα λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον... Ⲛ B D<sup>Pr</sup> d]) shows once again how Codex Bezae retains a reading that reflects exactly Peter's proposal to recover only the apostolic function (τόπον τὸν τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς), that is, not an indeterminate «place», but specifically «the place of this apostolic ministry», «his office», leaving vacant «the place» occupied by Judas, his «estate being left desolate». Codex Vaticanus, on the other hand, speaks simply of «taking the place of this apostolic ministry» (λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον —with the article— τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς), without distinguishing between the seat and the function. The place where Judas ended up, after having exchanged the share of the ministry that he exercised in messianic Israel for the «field acquired with the product of his iniquity», is qualified by Luke as the «proper place for him» (εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον). The careful subtlety of the Codex Bezae is only explicable by its closeness to the original text.

### 9. A Casting of Lots or a Vote by Ballot?

The assembly of the Hundred and Twenty was now ready to choose between the two candidates. It was not, contrary to the traditional interpretation,

a matter of «casting lots» (βάλλειν κλήρους), a typical means recorded in the Jewish Scriptures for taking decisions, but rather of «giving lots» (διδόναι κλήρους, Acts 1:26) which means «to vote». The expression is found in the Scriptures frequently but only in the context of the tribes of Israel being allocated the «inheritance» of the territory designated for their occupation, a context that is probably being intentionally called to mind as the replacement of Judas, one of the representatives of the twelve tribes of Israel, is chosen. The word in Greek for «share» or «inheritance» or «lot» is exactly the same (κλήρος) and has already been used in the definition Peter gave of Judas as a representative of a patriarch (cf. 1:17, and the play-on-words in the Aramaic Akeldamach noted in § 2); it can also mean a «vote», and Luke uses the various senses here in this account to create a play-on-words in a characteristically Jewish style. The phrasing of Acts 1:26 varies slightly according to whether the AT or D05 text is read: «they gave votes for them» (ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτοῖς B) / «they gave their votes» (ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν D); «and the vote ([+ ὁ B] κλήρος) fell on Matthias»: the «vote» and also the «share» in the ministry. The process is, therefore, a genuine personalized ballot and not some random operation such as throwing pebbles to see which candidate God would choose through the working of chance.

If the two candidates were put forward by the assembly as a whole (AT), it is hard to explain how the ballot resulted in the last of the list being elected and not the first candidate whose many qualities were mentioned. Codex Bezae, in attributing the selection of the two candidates and the order of their names to Peter, suggests that his choice was not endorsed by the assembly of the Hundred and Twenty. The fact that Joseph Barnabas was a Hellenist Cypriot and, furthermore, a Levite, must not have been pleasing to the assembly of disciples who would have been prejudiced against a leader who did not come from the land of Israel. The result of the election, which essentially constitutes a rejection of the Hellenists as equal to the Hebrews (cf. Acts 6:1-8), will have far-reaching negative consequences within the future church of Jerusalem. The tension, which scarcely breaks the surface here, will erupt again later on.

#### 10. *The Position of Matthias in the Apostolic Group*

In the final clause of Acts 1:26, the two texts differ significantly in the way they consider Matthias' relation to the apostolic group. Both texts use the same verb «count with pebbles, vote, assign by a vote» (ψηφίζω) in the passive voice, but in different compounds. The AT uses a compound with two prepositions, giving it a perfective sense, «he was fully co-opted into» (συγκατεψηφίσθη), whereas the Codex Bezae uses a single preposition, «he was reckoned with» (συνεψηφίσθη). The differences in the verbs is matched by a further variant in the number of apostles mentioned which causes the results of the



election to be interpreted in different ways: according to the AT, Matthias was «co-opted with the Eleven apostles» so that the number Twelve was perfectly restored. In contrast, according to Codex Bezae Matthias «was reckoned with the Twelve apostles», in other words he is counted alongside the original group which included, and still includes, Judas. He will exercise his office of apostle together with the Eleven but he will never take up the place left by Judas since his «estate» is to remain deserted (cf. 1:20).

### 11. *Conclusions and Countertest*

Two main proposals can be formulated on the basis of this study, namely, 1) that the circle of the Twelve apostles should not have been restored after the death of Judas, and 2) that the Eleven forced through the replacement of Judas, against Jesus' wishes. These are conclusions that have been arrived at largely on the basis of the text of Codex Bezae. Since, however, the majority of exegeses use the text of the modern critical editions (<sup>27</sup>N-A, <sup>4</sup>UBS), which is based essentially on the Alexandrian text and which has been adopted internationally by an agreement between the Vatican and the United Bible Societies, it is important to see, given the significance of the conclusions, how far they can be sustained from the more familiar text. To facilitate an overall view, the Greek text of Codex Vaticanus (B03) and Codex Bezae (D05) is set out in parallel columns with the Vaticanus text on the left hand side. Changes or additional material in the respective codex are highlighted in bold, with word order variation indicated in italics. Some of the ideas in this section is repeated from earlier discussion but the purpose of including it here is to focus on the differences in the message being communicated by the two texts.

1) As far as the *first* proposal is concerned, the variants detected between the codices do not affect the interpretation that the twelfth apostle was not meant to have been replaced. Any implied criticism of the apostles is lessened, however, in Codex Vaticanus and the intention of certain of its readings seems to be to cast the apostles in a more positive light. It is certainly easier in Codex Vaticanus to accept the apostles' actions without question.

#### a) *The Conferring of Sovereignty (Lk. 22:28-30)*

B03

Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔστε

οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς  
πειρασμοῖς μου·

D05

**Καὶ ὑμεῖς ἠὺξήθητε ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ  
μου ὡς ὁ διακονῶν,**

οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς  
πειρασμοῖς μου,

καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό  
μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν,  
ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ... ἐν τῇ βασι-  
λείᾳ μου καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων  
τάς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσ-  
ραήλ.

καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό  
μοι ὁ πατήρ βασιλείαν,  
ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ... ἐν τῇ βασι-  
λείᾳ καὶ καθήξεσθε ἐπὶ **ιβ**· θρόνους  
κρίνοντες **ιβ**· φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

βασιλεία is translated as «sovereignty» but the same point could be made with the translation «kingdom» (see § 1 above).

Codex Vaticanus omits Jesus' observation that the Twelve have grown because of his serving them and thus eliminates his insistence that any greatness they may have is derived from him. Because of this, Jesus' action of conferring sovereignty on them reads in Codex Vaticanus as a reward for their persevering with him in his trials: «you have persevered and I confer on you sovereignty», whereas in Codex Bezae the insistence on the role of Jesus in giving the Twelve anything they may have is maintained: «it is I who confer on you...».

b) *Judas's Betrayal* (Lk. 22:47)

B03

Ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος  
ἰδοὺ ὄχλος καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος  
Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα  
προήρχετο αὐτούς·  
καὶ ἐγγίσεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλεῖν αὐ-  
τόν.

Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·  
Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώ-  
που παραδίδως;

D05

Ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος  
ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς καὶ ὁ καλούμενος  
Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα  
προήγεν αὐτούς.  
καὶ ἐγγίσας ἐφίλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.  
τούτον γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς·  
Ὅν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν.  
ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τῷ Ἰούδα·  
Φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πα-  
ραδίδως;

Just as Judas' place among the Twelve is underlined in several places (Lk. 6:16; 22:3.47; Acts 1:17.25), so in Codex Bezae it is made clear that his betrayal does not cause him to lose his place. The wording used by D05 to describe Judas' action of approaching Jesus with a kiss is identical to that used to describe the kiss of Jacob with which he deceived his father and betrayed his

brother, Esau (Gen. 27:27). The implication is that despite the enormity of his wrongdoing, Judas is still considered to be a representative of the patriarchs. By the variant reading, Codex Vaticanus omits this assimilation and thereby takes away the notion that Judas retained his place among the Twelve even in the midst of his betrayal of Jesus.

c) *The Eleven* (Lk. 24:9.33; Acts 1:13)

B03

D05

Lk.  
Καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημεί-  
ου

ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔνδε-  
κα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς.

Lk.  
Καὶ εὗρον ἡθροισμένους τοὺς ἔνδε-  
κα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς.

Acts

ὁ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης  
καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἀνδρέας,  
Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς,  
Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Μαθθαῖος,  
Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων ὁ ζη-  
λωτὴς καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

Lk.  
Καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι

ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα ταῦτα τοῖς ἔνδε-  
κα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς.

Lk.

Καὶ εὗρον ἡθροισμένους τοὺς ἑ-  
καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς.

Acts

ὁ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης,  
Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἀνδρέας,  
Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς,  
Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Μαθθαῖος,  
Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, Σίμων ὁ ζη-  
λωτὴς καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

The two mentions of «the Eleven» appear without variation in both codices at the end of the first volume and are corroborated at the beginning of the second with the listing of eleven proper names. Compared with the first list of the Twelve in Lk. 6:14-16, the absence of the name of Judas Iscariot, the variation in the linking of the names and the different order in which they are cited, all serve to establish a contrast between the choice of the Twelve by Jesus and the organisation of the Eleven at the time they decided to choose a replacement for the twelfth member. The mere mention of «the Eleven», once Judas's death has occurred, contrasts with the repeated mention in the Gospel of «the Twelve» as chosen by Jesus. It is clear that they have lost their representativity before Israel because of the defection of Judas. Luke gave a repeated warning that this would be the case by underlining Judas's place as a member of the Twelve at the time he betrayed Jesus for money (Lk. 22:3) and when the money was paid (22:47), as well as in the account of his death (Acts 1:17).

In addition to the circle of the Twelve, chosen by Jesus from among the Israelite disciples (καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἑβδωδέκα, Lk. 6:13) so

that they should represent the Messianic Israel, Luke relates in the Gospel how Jesus appointed a second circle, that of the Seventy (Seventy Two, D05) selected by Jesus from among his followers (**ἀπέδειξεν δὲ καὶ** [ἀνέδειξεν δὲ] **ἐτέρους •οβ•** [ἐβδομήκοντα], Lk. 10:1) to prepare his way as he passed through Samaria by announcing the Kingdom of God there. This in itself shows that the project of Jesus was not limited to the Twelve, and that if his representatives failed, there would be an alternative group. This wider group is seen in the book of Acts contrasted with the apostles, as the group of the Hellenists who, like the Seventy in the Gospel, were the ones who were successful in taking the good news about the kingdom to people outside orthodox Israel. Far from being a definitive failure, therefore, the death of Judas will open the door to a more universal representation of the Messiah once the apostolic circle ceases to exercise control over the Church (from Acts 6 onwards).

d) *Jesus' Universal Commission (Lk. 24:46.47-48 // Acts 1:8b)*

B03

D05

Lk.

Οὕτως γέγραπται ... κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. **ἀρχάμενοι** ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων.

Acts

καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

Lk.

Οὕτως γέγραπται ... κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν **καὶ** ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν **ὥς ἐπὶ** πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. **ἀρχαμένων** ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ. **καὶ** ὑμεῖς δὲ μάρτυρες τούτων.

Acts

καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

Both codices underline that the invitation to repent and the subsequent testimony of the apostles have to reach «all the Gentiles/nations», that is, go «to the end of the earth». According to the Codex Vaticanus, «repentance for the forgiveness of sins» (John the Baptist's formula, Lk. 3:3, par. Mk 1:4) has «to be preached to all the Gentiles/nations» with the starting point of the testimony being «Ierousalem». The text of Codex Bezae is structured differently, with the participle «beginning» agreeing not with the apostles who are the witnesses, but with the sins for which «repentance and forgiveness» (formula used by Peter in referring to Jesus, Acts 5:31) is to be preached. Furthermore, the order that the witness about Jesus has to be addressed to all the Gentiles is emphasised in Codex Bezae for it is new information, this being the first time that the Gentiles are mentioned explicitly in that text of Luke's

Gospel.<sup>15</sup> In both texts, the exclusive privilege of the Jewish people is undermined and, in the Bezan text, their superiority over the Gentiles is challenged.

e) *Conditions for Receiving the Promise (Lk. 24:49 // Acts 1:4-5)*

B03

D05

Lk.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ **ἐξαποστέλλω** τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς·  
ὕμεῖς δὲ καθίστατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ  
ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δυνάμιν.

Acts

παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι,  
ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ... ὅτι ... ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ

οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας.

Lk.

καὶ ἐγὼ **ἀποστέλλω** τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς·  
ὕμεῖς δὲ καθίστατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως  
**οὗτου** ἐνδύσησθε δυνάμιν ἐξ ὕψους.

Acts

παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι,  
ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ... ὅτι ... ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ βαπτισθήσεσθε,

**καὶ ὁ μέλλετε λαμβάνειν**  
οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας  
**ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς.**

The promise of the Holy Spirit is given in order to equip the apostles with power to carry out the universal mission entrusted to them. Until they receive the Spirit, they are to wait. The length of time Jesus set for this waiting period was short (emphasised with a litotes); had they been in tune with Jesus' way of thinking, the Eleven apostles would have respected the waiting time, without undertaking any action that would compromise the coming of the Spirit and especially the universal commission for which he would equip them. Codex Vaticanus does not set a definite limit on the time, saying simply «after not many days», whereas Codex Bezae specifies that the term would extend over 10 days at the most, no longer than the Jewish feast of Pentecost. The inclusion of this detail about Pentecost makes it apparent that the Spirit almost did not come in time: it was right at the end of the period Jesus had promised, on the day of Pentecost itself and already nine in the morning, the day having started with sunset the evening before. The fact that the Holy Spirit delayed the fulfil-

15. In the Bezae text of Luke's Gospel, Simeon makes no mention of the Gentiles (Lk. 2:32 D). Likewise, according to the account of Jesus' teaching in Codex Bezae, there is no mention of the Holy Spirit given to «these who ask» (11:13 D).

ment of the Promise is linked to the tension that had arisen between the disciples and the brothers of Jesus and the fact that Peter had gone against Jesus' instructions.

f) *Jesus Leaves the Circle of Twelve Incomplete* (Lk. 24:50a // Acts 1:6).

B03

D05

Lk.  
Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἕως πρὸς Βη-  
θανίαν.

Acts  
Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἡρώτων αὐ-  
τὸν λέγοντες· «Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ  
τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασι-  
λείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ;»

Lk.  
Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἕξω πρὸς Βη-  
θανίαν.

Acts  
Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἐπηρώτων αὐ-  
τὸν λέγοντες· «Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ  
τούτῳ ἀποκαταστάνεις εἰς τὴν βασι-  
λείαν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ...;»

Just before Jesus' ascension,<sup>16</sup> the Eleven question him about «restoration». In Codex Vaticanus, the question is about the «restoration of the kingdom to Israel», and seems to refer in general terms about the Restoration of Israel which was one of the great hopes of the Jewish people, that when the Messiah came, he would take away the domination of the Gentiles and give back to Israel their independence and power. Codex Bezae expresses it differently: the apostles are insistent in their asking Jesus about the «restoration to the kingdom of Israel of...» The kingdom of Israel is viewed as intact except for something which they never get to express because the question is left unfinished. As explained earlier (see § 3), the critical element that is missing from Israel at this time of the Messianic arrival is the body of the twelve patriarchs as represented (according to Jesus' own teaching, cf. Lk. 22) by the Twelve apostles. With the death of Judas, there are only Eleven of them, and it is only to be expected that they should think that Jesus will find someone to fill the vacant place before he leaves them, for he was the one that chose the original Twelve, «inspired by the Holy Spirit» (Acts 1:2). Jesus, however, had no intention of selecting a disciple to replace Judas so as to bring back the number of the apostles to twelve – Judas's death as a godless man means that the body of the Twelve apostles has been broken up and changes their function in relation to Israel. For the time being, the Eleven apostles are not able to grasp this radical

16. The apostles seem to have been aware that Jesus was about to leave them when they started to ask him about the «restoration». See *The Message*, 70-74.

change that the death of Judas has brought about. Jesus no doubt hoped that if they waited for the Holy Spirit, they would understand better once they had his benefit of his enlightenment, but such was their sense of urgency to prevent James from taking the place of Judas that they did not wait.

2) The *second* proposal, namely, that the apostles forced through the replacement of Judas can be readily deduced from Codex Bezae but is scarcely evident in Codex Vaticanus. They went ahead with finding a new apostle because they thought it was the best thing to do in the circumstances they were facing – although the presentation of the scene is actually quite subtle in Codex Bezae for, what is also apparent, is that the apostles attempted to effect some sort of compromise so as to comply as best they could with Jesus' wishes. This nuance is absent from Codex Vaticanus.

a) *The Eleven Return to Jerusalem (Lk. 24:52 // Acts 1:12)*

B03

D05

Lk.

Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν  
ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ  
χαρᾶς.

Acts

Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ  
ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶ-  
νος,  
ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλὴμ σαββάτου  
ἔχον ὁδόν.

Lk.

Καὶ αὐτοὶ  
ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ  
χαρᾶς μεγάλης.

Acts

Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ  
ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶ-  
νος,  
ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλὴμ σαββάτου  
ἔχον ὁδόν.

Ignoring Jesus' action in taking them out of Ierousalem and his order to them to wait in «Hierosoluma» meaning the city and not the Jewish institution, the Eleven «returned to Ierousalem» in the religious sense. In so doing, they continued to be fully part of the Jewish institution, intending to remain within the system of Jewish regulations as indicated by the comment on the distance between the Mt of Olives and Jerusalem «a Sabbath day's journey». Both codices are in complete agreement on this point. Moreover, they returned with «**great** (omit B03) joy», giving the impression that they thought they fully understood and embraced Jesus' instructions.

Codex Vaticanus further portrays the Eleven as worshipping Jesus immediately after his ascension before returning to Jerusalem: «they worshipped him» (Lk. 24:52) something that Jesus refused to do before Satan (Lk. 4:7-8) and that Peter does not accept from Cornelius (Acts 10:25 D) when he says to him

«What are you doing? I am also a man like you» (10:26 D); worship of Jesus is not otherwise expressed in Acts where the disciples are portrayed instead as worshipping God (cf. e.g. 2:47; 3:8.9; 4:24-30).

b) *The Eleven go to the Upper Room of the Temple (Lk. 24:53 // Acts 1:13)*

B03

D05

Lk.

Καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ  
εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν.

Acts

Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον (the Eleven),  
εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶν ἀνέβησαν

οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες.

Lk.

Καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ  
αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεόν.

Acts

Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν (Peter),  
ἀνέβησαν (the Eleven) εἰς τὸ ὑπερ-  
ῶν

οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες.

Because Luke's two descriptions of the apostles' movements on returning to Ierousalem are in parallel, it can be deduced that he intends the «upper room» to be the equivalent of «the Temple». Both codices agree also on this point, although Codex Bezae, with the first verb in singular, indicates that the initiative to go up to the Temple was taken by Peter. Codex Vaticanus, by changing the word order, emphasises the upper room. Both codices underline, with the periphrastic construction in the imperfect tense, that their continued presence there, a factor that will be emphasised a second time when the presence of the brothers of Jesus is noted (1:14, see below). The implication of the Eleven going to the Temple is that they continue to view their role and Jesus' actions and instructions within the framework of traditional Jewish thinking about the importance of the Temple and the authorities in Ierousalem.

c) *The Presence of Mary and the Brothers of Jesus in the Upper Room (Acts 1:14)*

B03

D05

Οὗτοι πάντες (the Eleven apostles)  
ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες  
ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ  
σὺν γυναῖξιν  
καὶ **Μαριὰμ** τῇ μητρὶ Ἰησοῦ  
καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.

Οὗτοι πάντες (the Eleven apostles)  
ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες  
ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ  
σὺν **ταῖς** γυναῖξιν καὶ **τέκνοις**  
καὶ **Μαρία** μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ  
καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.



In addition to the Eleven, with their wives and children according to Codex Bezae, or with some indeterminate women according to Codex Vaticanus, there were also the «brothers of Jesus» accompanied by «Mary his mother» in the upper room. Both groups are united in their attachment to Jesus, albeit for different reasons, but there is a tension between the groups which will soon become apparent.

d) *Peter Initiates Action (Acts 1:15)*

B03

**Καὶ** ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις  
ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελ-  
φῶν εἶπεν·  
—ἦν **τε** ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ  
**ὥσει** ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι—  
«Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί...»

D05

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις  
ἀναστὰς ὁ Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν **μα-**  
**θητῶν** εἶπεν·  
—ἦν **γὰρ** ὁ ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ  
αὐτὸ **ὡς** 'ρξ·—  
«Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί...»

The designation of the Hundred and Twenty as «brothers» by Codex Vaticanus does not allow «the brothers of Jesus» to be distinguished from the «disciples». According to Codex Bezae, Peter does not include the family of Jesus among his addressees who are described as sharing the same purpose (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), for they, clearly, do not share the same concern as the apostles, nor of the disciples generally to see Judas replaced. Moreover, the brothers of Jesus would never have accepted to form part of a quorum that could harm their dynastic claims. The importance of the symbolism of the number 120 is not so clearly evident in Codex Vaticanus; according to Codex Bezae, the parenthetical aside forms the minor premise of Peter's arguments, the scriptural argument being the major premise.

e) *Peter's Appeal to Scripture (Acts 1:16 – LXX Ps. 68:26 + 108:8)*

B03

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, **ἔδει** πληρωθῆναι  
τὴν γραφὴν ... περὶ Ἰούδα ...  
ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ  
ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύ-  
της  
—οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτίσατο χωρίον ἐκ  
μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας ... χωρίον αἵμα-  
τος.

D05

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, **δεῖ** πληρωθῆναι  
τὴν γραφὴν **ταύτην** ... περὶ Ἰούδα ...  
ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ  
ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύ-  
της  
—οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτίσατο χωρίον ἐκ  
μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας **αὐτοῦ** ... χωρίον  
αἵματος.

γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν·  
 «Γενηθήτω ἡ ἐπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος  
 καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ  
 καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτε-  
 ρος.»  
 δεῖ οὖν ... σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἓνα τού-  
 των.

γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν·  
 «Γενηθήτω ἡ ἐπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος  
 καὶ μὴ ἡ ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ  
 καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτε-  
 ρος.»  
 δεῖ οὖν ... σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἓνα τού-  
 των.

According to Codex Vaticanus, the Scripture that «had to be fulfilled» concerning Judas has already been fulfilled. To which passage of the Scripture is reference being made? Of the citations from the book of Psalms that follow (Acts 1:20) only the first can be appealed since the second has not yet been fulfilled, that is, Ps. 68:26 in which Codex Vaticanus harmonises ἔστω with the LXX. According to Codex Bezae, «this Scripture» that has yet «to be fulfilled» provides the justification Peter needs in order to accept, on the one hand, Jesus' refusal to appoint a replacement for Judas and to prevent, on the other hand, the brothers of Jesus from activating their claim to succeed the Messiah because of their blood ties. Peter is convinced that it is the will of God (δεῖ) for the Scripture relating to Judas and to the apostolic function exercised by him to be fulfilled but, at the same time, he is prepared to leave vacant the seat Judas occupied in the circle of the Twelve, in line with what he has understood about Jesus' wishes. That he is aware of the formal significance of what he is about to propose is indicated by the detail that there was the required number of people present to represent Israel, one Hundred and Twenty, with the adverb ὥς signalling the metaphorical importance of the number, in contrast to ὥσει of other manuscripts (e.g. 8) which makes the number an approximate one.

f) *The Presentation of the Candidates (Acts 1:23)*

B03

Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο·  
 Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββάν  
 ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰουῆτος,  
 καὶ Μαθηῖαν.

D05

Καὶ ἔστησεν δύο·  
 Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρναβάν  
 ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰουῆτος,  
 καὶ Μαθηῖαν.

Codex Vaticanus not only a) attributes the preparation of the list of candidates to the assembly, but also b) places at the head of the list a character who is completely unknown within the narrative of Acts, Joseph Barsabbas. It is somewhat incongruous that the same assembly that has drawn up the list should thereafter elect the least qualified. If, on the other hand, it were Peter

who proposed the list, as stated by Codex Bezae, insisting on the great qualities of Joseph Barnabas, the result of the election for him and for the apostles he represents will be a vote against his favourite.

g) *Prayer to God for the Election (Acts 1:24)*

B03

Σὺ κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων,  
ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν  
δύο ἕνα λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακο-  
νίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς ἀφ' ἧς  
παρέβη Ἰούδας πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν  
τόπον τὸν ἴδιον.

D05

Κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων,  
ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν  
δύο ἀναλαβεῖν τόπον τὸν τῆς διακο-  
νίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς ἀφ' ἧς  
παρέβη Ἰούδας πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν  
τόπον τὸν ἴδιον.

Once again Codex Vaticanus *a*) is ambiguous as to whether the «Lord» invoked is God or Jesus. By virtue of its familiar tone, the personal pronoun in the second person would seem to refer to the resurrected Lord Jesus. At the same time, *b*) it is less precise when distinguishing between the seat that had to be left empty and the apostolic function that had to be taken. Codex Bezae removes any ambiguity and speaks only of «taking up» a part of Judas' legacy, «the place of this apostolic service».

h) *Election of Matthias (Acts 1:26a)*

B03

Καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτοῖς,  
καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλήρος ἐπὶ Μαθθίαν.

D05

Καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν,  
καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλήρος ἐπὶ Μαθθίαν.

While it is clearly a matter of a personal ballot according to Codex Bezae, «they gave their lots», it is not so clear in the wording of Codex Vaticanus. The fact that «they gave their lots» and that the «lot» fell on Matthias only makes sense if it is a matter of a genuine ballot. The expression cannot be construed as the process of «casting lots» which is often mentioned in the Jewish Scriptures but using a different verb than the one used here.

i) *Restoration of the Circle of the Twelve Apostles (Acts 1:26b)*

B03

D05

Καὶ συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἑν-  
δεκα ἀποστόλων.

Καὶ συνεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἱβ' ἀπο-  
στόλων.

Where the differences between the codices are most noticeable is in the final result of the ballot. For Codex Vaticanus, Matthias was fully integrated into the circle of the Twelve: he «was co-opted with the Eleven apostles». Accordingly, immediately afterwards, in Peter's speech at Pentecost, the narrator informs us —still according to the Codex Vaticanus— that «Peter stood up with the Eleven (σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκα) and lifted up his voice...» (Acts 2:14 B). For Codex Bezae, on the other hand, Matthias was only added to the circle of the Twelve: he «was reckoned with the Twelve apostles». This is logical, since it was intended that he would only exercise the apostolic function that Judas held, but not occupy the seat, which will remain vacant for ever. Consequently, in introducing Peter's Pentecost speech, the narrator of Codex Bezae will say: «So then Peter stood up with the Ten apostles (σὺν τοῖς δέκα ἀποστόλοις) and was the first to lift up his voice...» (Acts 2:14 D).

For the purpose of this comparison of texts, Codex Vaticanus has been taken as a representative of the Alexandrian tradition; much the same results would be obtained by taking another Alexandrian witness. The tendency of the AT to smooth out the imperfections that could harm the reputation of the Twelve apostles will be supported by the later tradition, to the extent that today few people question that the Twelve apostles form the foundation of the Church. It is unlikely that Peter was thinking in terms of the future of the Church when he stood up to announce the need to replace Judas. His concern was to maintain the apostolic group as the representatives of the Messiah and to maintain the number of apostles as Twelve in order to prevent the brothers of Jesus from establishing a rival claim. In the end, his efforts did not have a lasting benefit since in time, it will be James, the brother of the Lord, who will take over the leadership of the church of Jerusalem (cf. Acts 12:17; 15:13-21 and 21:18), and who will control events both at the Jerusalem council and on Paul's visit to Jerusalem when he brings the collection (Acts 21). As for Peter, he himself will be freed from the traditional Jewish hopes and expectations that so shaped his way of thinking, and will leave once and for all the Jewish institution when the angel of the Lord delivers him from the prison where Herod, king of the Jews and encouraged by the approval of the Jewish people, had shut him up (Acts 12:3): «Now I know that truly the Lord

sent his angel and rescued me from ... all the expectation of the people of the Jews.»<sup>17</sup>

Josep RIUS-CAMPS

Església de Sant Pere de Reixac

Apartat 41

E – 08110 MONTCADA I REIXAC (Barcelona)

CATALONIA (Spain)

E-mail: riuscamps@yahoo.es

Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER

20 East Lane

EMBSAY

N. Yorkshire

BD23 6QA

E-mail: jenny@heimerdinger.freeseve.co.uk

## Summary

The article asks some probing questions about the continued validity of the apostolic circle once Judas was missing from it. From a comparison of Luke's two-volume work (Gospel and Acts) in the text of Alexandrian manuscripts with that of Codex Bezae, it emerges that some criticism of the apostles' action to replace Judas is implied, and is made more forcefully in the Bezan text. It was the presence of Jesus' brothers with them while they were waiting for the Holy Spirit that prompted the Eleven to take hasty action and so step outside Jesus' will. The apostles' sought to maintain their role as representatives of the patriarchs of Israel but in so doing failed to notice that, with the death of Judas, a break with the ancient Jewish traditions had to be made. It is only as God intervenes in the unfolding story recorded in Acts that recognition of the radically new plan for his people will be gradually achieved.

---

17. On Peter's release from the «prison» of Jewish expectations and the interpretation of the prison as the eschatological temple of the Messianic age, see READ-HEIMERDINGER, «The Re-Enactment of the History of Israel: Exodus Traditions in the Bezan Text of Acts», in R. POPE (ed.), *Honouring the Past and Shaping the Future (Religious and Biblical Studies in Wales)*, Leominster: Gracewing 2003, pp. 81-96 [89-93]).

## Resum

El present article formula algunes qüestions que indaguen sobre si havia de tenir continuïtat o no el cercle dels Dotze una vegada Judes havia deixat de formar-ne part. De la comparació de l'obra de Lluc (Evangeli i Fets) en el text dels manuscrits alexandrins amb el del Còdex Bezae s'infereix que aquesta implica una certa crítica de l'acció apostòlica escomesa per a reemplaçar Judes, una crítica que esdevé més vigorosa en el text de Bezae. La presència dels germans de Jesús en la mateixa sala superior on els Onze estaven expectant la vinguda del Sant Esperit fou la que els impel·lí a actuar apressadament i a fer cas omís de la voluntat del Senyor. Els apòstols intentaren mantenir la seva funció com a representants dels patriarques d'Israel, però obrant així no s'aperceberen que, amb la mort violenta de Judes, s'havia de fer una ruptura amb les antigues tradicions jueves. Solament quan Déu intervindrà en el desenvolupament de la història recordada en el llibre dels Fets serà quan hom prendrà consciència de com s'havia de dur a terme gradualment el pla radicalment nou que tenia per al seu poble.